



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

are bills being presented continually before parliament for an increase of the naval and military appropriations. If it is asked why this is so, the reply is that Japan fears an American aggression. In Japan it is feared that America will make war on Japan, and concerning this fear some things need to be said. Some years ago a distinguished gentleman published a book entitled "The Valor of Ignorance," in which he maintains that in twenty-five days the Japanese government could land on the coasts of America 200,000 soldiers, and she could without difficulty take the gold mines of Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines, because these places are quite defenseless. It is necessary, therefore, he argues, for America to increase her navy and strengthen the defenses of these places. This book is widely read in Japan, and has created a great deal of question among the people. Another eminent gentleman, in a book published not long ago, contends that commerce follows the flag, and therefore in order to gain the mastery of the Pacific, it is necessary for America to increase her navy, for it is intimated Japan also is intending to gain the mastery of the Pacific. But the Pacific Ocean is a great body of water, and many nations are connected with it—America, England, France, Germany, China, Japan, Russia, Holland—in fact, nearly all the great nations of the world are in some way related to the Pacific Ocean, and therefore it is not only impossible, but it is absolutely foolish, for any one nation to think of gaining the mastery of this highway of the nations of the world. These opinions of prominent Americans have set the Japanese to wondering what interpretation to put upon the attitude of America at this time. In my own opinion, of course, war is absolutely impossible between these two countries. Yet even the report of war is disastrous. It results in the cooling of friendship, a foolish expenditure of money, and the breaking up of necessary intercourse between these two otherwise friendly powers.

I said that in my opinion war is impossible. Let me briefly enumerate my reasons for so thinking. First, the commerce between Japan and America is of such very great importance that it virtually makes war impossible. America is Japan's best customer. Twenty-five per cent. of all Japan's foreign trade is with America. Whoever heard of a merchant quarreling with his best customer? On the other hand, Japan is also America's greatest customer in the East, and this commerce is increasing year by year.

Second, the friendly relations existing between the two countries have continued for many years, and cannot be easily disturbed. Through the religious and educational influences which have been brought to bear upon Japan this friendly relation has deepened and grown in strength with the years. Friendship is the strongest barrier against the possibility of a war. There may be historical reasons for the enmity between Japan and Russia. Many years ago, at the close of the Crimean war, Russian gunboats captured the Island of Tsushima, but through the intervention of England she was compelled to withdraw. She has encroached on Japan's territory from the north and the south, and this Japan has deeply resented. On the contrary, all of the long history of Japan's intercourse with America is but the story of a growing friendship, and this idea of friend-

ship being the possession of all the people makes it impossible for a war to occur between the two countries.

In conclusion, permit me to express my hope for the future. Up to the present time Japan has wasted much money in war and fruitless preparation for war; she now needs peace; she needs time in which to restore the vigor of the Japanese race, to increase the happiness and welfare of the people, and to encourage education and industry. It is the one ambition of my life that I may have something to do with the bringing about of this much-desired end. Already America has under consideration a treaty of general arbitration with England and France, and, though temporarily hindered, unquestionably the time will come when such a treaty will be formed. I hope to see the day when such a treaty will be formed, not alone between these three great nations, but when Japan also will be included. If Japan should enter such a treaty, then with England and America she would form a wall of peace extending from the East to the West making war forever impossible. This hope which I have here freely expressed is indeed my personal hope and desire but I am bold to say that it is also the hope and the desire of all the sensible men in every walk of life in Japan.

Arbitrating Questions of Honor.

Address of President Taft at the Public Mass-Meeting at Which was discussed the Arbitration Treaties with Great Britain and France, at the Hall of the Americas, Pan-American Building, Washington, D. C., December 8, 1911.

President Taft was then introduced, and received with long-continued applause. He spoke as follows:

Ladies and Gentlemen: You have just listened to a most interesting speech recounting the number of reasons why Japan and the United States ought to be and are united in bonds of amity. We heard from the distinguished gentleman who represents Japan the statement of his ambition that the day was not distant when Japan should be united with the other nations in such a peace obligation as that we are now trying to make complete between England and the United States on the one hand and between France and the United States on the other. I ask you whether we ought to defeat his ambition and the ambition of the people whom he represents by saying that there is some constitutional objection to the perfection of those treaties? Are we going to take the flavor out of this movement by some narrow reading of the powers of one of the branches of this Government? Are we going to cause a halt to a movement that now seems to have an impetus which will be worldwide, because there is some quirk in the construction of the powers of one of the legislative branches of this Government? You have got to hunt around to find it, at any rate. What is the use of discovering something that is of no use?

I have talked on the subject of these peace treaties in thirty different States—it seemed to me for breakfast, for luncheon, and for dinner. There are orators, like the chairman of the meeting here, who can make four different speeches for fifty-eight different days in thirty different States, but those of us who are more limited

have to fall into the same kind of argument, to use the same illustrations, and to enforce what we have to say in the same way and with the same language, until the poor people who accompany you on such a journey are in a bad way.

I remember the story of a young student at the University of Virginia who went home with a classmate to an old plantation in that State where they had family prayers. As they were kneeling, the father of the family prayed and prayed quite at length, so much so that the somewhat unregenerate visitor felt a little uncomfortable on his knees. He nudged his classmate to know when the end was to come. "Has he got to Braddock's defeat yet?" "No," said his classmate, "he has not." "Well, then, he is only half through." And so it was with those who had the misfortune to accompany me on the trip—if I put certain stories into my speeches they contributed greatly to their comfort and their quiet somnolence, but if I left them out there was an inquiry as to my normal condition. I don't feel like perpetrating upon this audience that speech, which comes back to me now with waves of memory, lest I should occupy too much of your time, and lest I might find among the audience some who had been unwise enough to read it after it was delivered. Then, too, there is another feeling that makes me hesitate. When I get out of Washington, and away from the eaves of the capital, I feel a little more at liberty to speak out with reference to the duty of the coördinate branch of the Government; but here the communications I have to make are limited by the Constitution, and ought to go directly to the body, rather than that I should stand upon the street corner, or even before such an intelligent and influential audience as this, and say what I think the Senate ought to do.

To recur again to the speech of the distinguished gentleman whom we have just heard. While Japan is not now one of the treaty-making powers with whom we are hoping to come into closer union by reason of these treaties, she has manifested her deep interest in the treaties and her sympathy in making them possible by waiving altogether one of the terms of a treaty she made with Great Britain which might have interfered with closing the treaty between the United States and Great Britain. We are indebted to her for that, and if she can make that concession, having no interest—or at least no direct interest—why cannot the Senate of the United States make a similar concession?

Those of us who are gathered here I am sure are not wild enthusiasts in respect to this movement, and do not hope for something that never can come about. I think we are practical people. We don't expect that war is going to be abolished tomorrow morning, or that the millennium is coming just after breakfast. We know that movements of this sort must progress slowly. But, on the other hand, we ought to have foresight and intelligence enough to recognize a real step of progress when it is taken. We shall never dispose of the movement toward armament and toward increasing armament until we satisfy the nations, who are carrying on this movement merely for self-defense and for the protection of their integrity, that there is some other means upon which they can really rely for the settlement of international controversies. When they find that means and can certainly rely on it, then they will give up

armament. It is not with pleasure that they are pursuing the policy of appropriating \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000, or half a billion dollars a year in order that their armament may increase. If they can count on some practical means by which that can be avoided against which the armament is to be a protection, then we can be certain that armament will be given up.

Now, ultimately, of course we all look forward to an arbitral court into which one nation may summon any other nation and make that other nation respond to a judgment of that court. It may be that the nation will come in unwillingly, but it will originally have made a treaty by which it agreed to abide the judgment of that court, and then the judgment having been rendered, it will be enforced either by public opinion of nations, or, if necessary, by an international police force. Then we shall have something upon which we can count. Now let me ask you whether we are ever going to get to that court, if it is impossible for the Senate of the United States to agree that we are bound to go into that court, whether the Senate likes it when the case comes or not? If that is the limitation upon the power of the Senate, we might just as well give up going into court at all or the hope that we will ever have such an arbitral court. We have got to surrender something, as Mr. Foster has said. We have got to surrender something of our independence if we are going to accomplish anything in the way of bringing about an administration of justice to which we are all subject internationally. The question of arbitrating honor gives me less trouble than anything else in the controversy, because we have before us the history of individuals, and we know what that is; and we know what quarrels are that involve honor, and we know that we have lived down the barbarous way of settling them. To say that you cannot satisfy your honor without shedding a little blood is to go back to the Dark Ages. When is it that you ought to have somebody to intervene and reach a common sense conclusion, except when your honor is involved? And thus those traits of your character are drawn into the controversy so that your anger is roused, and you are not in a position to look at the issue calmly and with judgment. It is just at that time that you want to call in somebody who is calm and who is not affected by those things that move a man with "good red blood," as it is said. You then want to call in somebody who can adjudge as between you and the person who has infringed what you regard as your honor, to say what the facts are. If there ever was a thing that ought to be adjudged, it is a question of honor. The truth is that there is nothing so humorous—and that is one of the saving graces of the American people—nothing so humorous, as you look back in the history of the English and the American people, as this method of settling disputes about honor. The idea that when a man has insulted me, the only way by which I can wipe out that insult is to invite him out into a ten-acre lot and stand myself up as a target at forty paces, to see whether he can hit me or not! You will understand that the kind of a target I make impresses me with the force of that argument. Of course, if I am a good marksman, and he is a fairly good target, and I have the right, under the code duello, to hit him if I can, if I do, and he misses me, I go home with that satisfaction with respect to conditions as they are that those who are situated comfortably in life usually have;

but if he hits me, and I escape death and take a convalescence of two or three months, I have to have a good deal subtler brain than I now have to reason out any way by which that result satisfied my honor in being insulted by him.

Now, there was a time in the history of the English people—not so long ago—when if an Englishman was sued in a court of justice—sued on a bond, it may be—he was brought in, and, being a little short of evidence, he demanded wager of battle on the issue whether he ever made the bond. Then the learned judges pulled out two long swords, arranged a 24-foot ring, and let the defendant and plaintiff get at each other with those swords. If the defendant cut off the head or the arm of the plaintiff and knocked him out, that established, as a matter of law and fact, in that court of justice, that he had never made the bond, or, if he had, that he had paid it. That was what they called “wager of battle.” I ask you if it does not seem as ridiculous as possible? Can it be that that was the case 250 years ago in the courts of justice of England, to which we look now for all the perfection possible in the principles of the administration of justice? Well, it is so historically. And yet, as I say, it awakens the risibles, and ought to, of every civilized person that hears it today. I would like to have you tell me in what respect the settlement of international controversies today differs in the slightest from the wager of battle in the courts of justice of England 250 years ago?

Now the question is whether we have ingenuity enough, whether we have perception enough, whether we have self-restraint enough, whether we have common sense enough to come together as peoples of this world and make an arrangement by which we shall settle controversies that arise in some more human, some more logical, some less brutal and unsatisfactory way than war?

It has fallen to this country to lead in this matter, and that is because we are so situated without entangling alliances, and so strong without the greatest army and without the greatest navy, that nobody would charge us with cowardice on account of trying to find some other method of settling international controversies than by war. Everybody knows—we know, and all the nations of the world would be willing to admit—that we are not a cowardly nation. Therefore we are not in a position where our motives can be misunderstood. We are in a position of comfortable isolation, where we don't have to keep up our armament as other nations do who live as closely as they do in Europe. The common people of Great Britain, of France, of Germany, and of the entire continent of Europe, look to us to lead in the cause of peace. Are we going to turn upon these people after we have made this step? Are we going to take the flavor out of the step that we have already taken? Are we going to turn back on this movement and say, “Well, we are very sorry; we are very sympathetic with you; we hope you will get along well, but there is something in our Constitution that prevents us from assuming any obligation in respect to the future decision of an arbitral court?” I hope not, and I am not going to make it any less probable by saying any more.

. . . The Emperor of Japan, on opening in person the Diet on December 27, said that he deeply deplored the disturbances in China and prayed for a speedy restoration of peace.

Progress Beyond the Most Sanguine Dreams.

Hon. Richard Bartholdt, Member of Congress from Missouri, and president of the Interparliamentary Union Group in Congress, was then introduced, and spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Only seven years have elapsed since the Interparliamentary Union, at its conference at St. Louis, adopted a resolution drafted by me and championed by the distinguished gentleman who presides tonight, declaring in favor of a second Hague Conference, and proposing, as a program for that great meeting, general arbitration treaties between the several nations as a means of lessening the possibilities of war. As I say, this was only seven years ago; and today? Why, the second Hague Conference has actually been held, and the general arbitration treaties, then vaguely hoped for, are as living realities before the great chancelleries of the world as the concrete proposition of a far-seeing American President, and Great Britain, France, and Germany, the three mightiest military countries on earth, have already given their formal assent to this great American policy.

It is progress, my friends, beyond the dreams even of those of us who have stood in the firing line of the war against war. And there is still more, I might almost say stronger, evidence of the rapid evolution in the direction of a more permanent condition of world peace. It does not consist in written agreements, but outside of those and back of those agreements a new spirit has manifested itself, a spirit which, besides compelling the dictation of and the adhesion to peace treaties, makes the avoidance of war a voluntary policy of government. The most recent history records a signal triumph of peace due to this spirit. By it the number of unfought wars has been increased by one significant instance. I do not refer to the Dogger Bank incident, which threatened a bloody war between England and Russia, but resolved itself, upon calm investigation, into a ludicrous case of mistaken identity, nor have I in mind the bloodless annexation by Austria of the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which surely, if attempted twenty, aye, even fifteen, years ago, would have precipitated a European war. No, I have reference to the peaceful settlement by Germany and France of the Morocco question. Rarely was public opinion as excited, has feeling run as high as in these two countries during last summer. Seldom has the jingo press with its inciting editorials had a more responsive audience than in the days of July and September. A single word, a single warlike pose of the ruler was all that was required to set in motion the terrible machinery of a modern war between two first-class powers. The warmongers would have endeavored to justify such a calamity. It would have been easy for them to demonstrate the historical necessity of such a war, as the conflict was between nations which the fanatics of international anarchy have made the people believe to be arch enemies. At the time, owing to the state of the public mind, it was a thousand times easier to justify war than to justify the preservation of peace. But the German Emperor—honor to him!—determinedly stood his ground. Although at the head of the greatest military establishment of the world, in command of a power large enough to crush almost any